



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CH  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,397	08/22/2003	Christopher D. Gocke	97,078-O	9512

7590 10/31/2006  
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff  
32nd Floor  
300 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

HORLICK, KENNETH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1637

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/646,397

**Applicant(s)**

GOCKE ET AL:

**Examiner**

Kenneth R. Horlick

**Art Unit**

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/4/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 09/06/06 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US 6,939,675 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 and 10-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sorenson et al. (1994 Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention).

These claims are drawn to methods comprising extracting extracellular DNA from blood plasma or serum, amplifying two or more genes associated with cancer, and detecting the amplified genes.

Although not explicitly taught in Sorenson et al., such a method is very clearly suggested (see entire publication on pages 67-71, especially the last paragraph on page 70). It is submitted that the teachings of Sorenson et al. as a whole indicate

Art Unit: 1637

“reasonable likelihood of success” as opposed to merely “obvious to try” experimentation. It is also noted that prior prosecution in the parent applications has established several prior art references besides Sorenson et al. 1994 which teach detection of cancer-associated genes in blood serum or plasma of subjects as cancer markers.

3. With respect to the above rejection, the arguments of the response filed 09/06/06 have been fully considered, but are not found persuasive. The Office does not agree that the “teachings of the Sorenson reference are significantly more limited than the Action gives it credit for being”. The amplification taught in Sorenson et al. cannot be distinguished from the amplification required in the claims. Further, methods of amplifying more than one target nucleic acid from the same sample, as suggested by Sorenson et al. in the case of “a variety of individual mutated oncogenes in plasma or serum”, either sequentially or simultaneously (i.e., multiplex), were unarguably conventional in the art at the time of the invention, thus surely providing for reasonable expectation of success.

The response also points to a supposed contradiction between the obviousness rejection over Sorenson et al., the obviousness-type double patenting (ODP) rejection over claims 10-13 of the '675 patent, and the fact that said claims 10-13 were found to be allowable in view of the Sorenson et al. reference. Thus, the response concludes that “claims that are not patentably distinct from patented claims found by the Office to be patentable over the cited prior art cannot be unpatentable over that same art.”

Art Unit: 1637

However, this logic does not apply in the instant situation, and there is in fact no contradiction. The ODP rejection is based upon a genus-species relationship among the claim sets, wherein the instant claims are broader than the patented claims and thus encompass them. Applicant is reminded that the patented claims all require detection of a non-mutated DNA associated with cancer, which is not taught or suggested by Sorenson et al. Hence, the ODP and obviousness rejections are consistent with the claims issued in the '675 patent.

4. No claims are free of the prior art.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1637

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth R. Horlick whose telephone number is 571-272-0784. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Kenneth R Horlick, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1637

10/26/06